

RESEARCH CORPORATION

405 LEXINGTON AVENUE, NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10017

KENDALL W. KING
ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT—GRANTS

October 2, 1969

Professor Joshua Lederberg
Department of Genetics
Stanford University Medical Center
Stanford, California 94305

Dear Professor Lederberg:

Thanks ever so much for your response of September 11 along with C. G. Jung's comments, the proposal for an Undergraduate Program in Human Biology at Stanford, and the announcement of Nobel Symposium 14.

You made a couple of specific suggestions which we might fruitfully discuss further. First, the stipend problem for David Sachs. I am not highly optimistic but would be happy to bring it before our staff for consideration if you would provide me with more information on his background, his professional aspirations, and the course of study he would be pursuing.

You also mentioned a program of "fellowships-in-situ." I am nibbling but I am not yet hooked. I am leery of the restriction of such a program to scientists with "well established credentials." There are a number of reasons for this cautiousness. First, people of that stature in the scientific community do not seem to me to be particularly lacking in opportunities to explore privately and publicly their thoughts. Second, people with such credentials would, I fear, for the most part represent the Establishment of science, and these very men have a relatively poor record to point to in connection with developing a science that can grapple with the human conditions. I would be a little more inclined to look for youngsters in their thirties with solid but perhaps less established credentials where one would be applying the bellows to hotter coals. I do not mean this in any way to be critical of you and your colleagues. Rather, what I mean to be doing is countering with the suggestion that perhaps the


Professor Joshua Lederberg
Stanford University Medical Center

October 2, 1969
Page 2

need of such a fellowship among men of your position is much less than the need to bring the promising youngsters into a position where their thinking can develop in the direction yours has followed.

I have looked at the Stanford curriculum proposals with a great deal of interest. Frankly, it looks like a very promising development. My only concern, and this may reflect simply my ignorance of the accomplishments of some of your colleagues, would be with the subject matter's solidity (that is a nasty piece of jargon but I hope you get the message) for the treatment of such topics as population, food and environment, nutrition and agriculture. I have wrestled with these for ten or eleven years now as I fell from the company of the enzymological archangels to those inhabitants of the Dark Country who were concerned with the problem of eradicating clinical malnutrition from among the peasantries of the Caribbean and Latin America. My own role has not been very important but the success of the effort has been, and demonstrates quite clearly that an amino acid analyzer out of Beckman/Spinco has a very real relevance to fatal malnutrition in the preschool child if you just use it right. I am enclosing a couple of reprints that may be of interest to you in that connection. The ones that are numbered should perhaps best be read in that order.

Sincerely yours,


Kendall W. King
KWK:GG
Enclosures